Rev. 05/19/09			Doc. Code: DISQ.CKLIST
TERMINAL DISCLAIMER INFORMAL CHECKLIST			
APPL. S.N.:	10/581,918	DATE:	12/27/2010
EXAMINER:	HONG SANG	ART UNIT:	1643
PARALEGAL:	/JOYCE A. BRIDGERS/	MAIL ROOM D	DATE: 12/22/2010
NUMBER OF TD(s) F	TILED: ONE		
If you agree, please us applicant about the TI	the paralegal has reviewed the submitted TD with the result se the appropriate form paragraphs identified by this inform D. If you disagree, please contact a QAS. IS AN INFORMAL, INTERNAL CHECKLIST ONLY	nal memo in your n	ext Office action to notify
	ILL BE SOFT SCANNED AND NOT VIEWABLE TO		
☐ The TD is PROPE	R and has been accepted and recorded. (See FP 14.23.)		
☑ The TD is NOT PROPER and has not been accepted for the reason(s) checked below. (See FP 14.24.)			
	e under 37 CFR 1.20(d) in the amount of \$ has not be to charge to a deposit account. (See FP 14.24 and 14.26.0)		is there any pre authorization
☐ The LIE has not pr	rocessed fee for TD (the Paralegal should ask LIE to proces	ss the fee).	
his/her ownership	atisfy 37 CFR 1.32(b) (3) in that the person who signed the interest, or (b) the extent of the business/organization entite FPs 14.26 and 14.26.01.)		
	- enforceable only during the period of common ownership (See FP 14.27.01).	– clause needed to	o overcome a double patenting
	CFR 1.321(d) statement for joint research agreement under reability provisions of 37 CFR 1.321(d). (See FP 14.27.011		2) & (3). It doesn't include the
	a particular claim(s); this is not acceptable, since the disclared, MPEP 1490. (See FPs 14.26 and 14.26.02).	imer must be of a t	erminal portion of the entire
☐ The person who si	gned the terminal disclaimer:		
failed to state	his/her capacity to sign for the business/organization entity	. (See FP 14.28.)	
is not recogniz	zed as an officer of the assignee. (See FP 14.29.)		
does not have	power of attorney, and thus, is not of record. (See FP 14.29	9.01.)	
established by a list of	ven to a customer number, wherein all practitioners listed used practitioners, the list may not comprise more than 10 practign the TD unless it is established that the representative is	titioners. A represe	entative of the assignee, who is
documentary evid documentary evid	ported by evidence of chain of title to the assignee signing thence of a chain of title from the original inventor(s) to the allence was, or concurrently is being, submitted for recordation evidence is recorded in the Office. 37 CFR 3.73(b). (See	assignee and a state on; or (b) the reel a	ement affirming that the and frame number(s) where

NOTE: This documentary evidence or the specifying of the reel and frame number may be found in the TD or in a separate paper submitted by applicant.)
☐ The TD is not supported by adequate evidence of chain of title to the assignee signing the TD, because the person who signed the submission under 37 CFR 3.73(b):
has failed to state his/her capacity to sign for the business entity. (See FPs 14.30.02 and 14.16.02
is not recognized as an officer of the assignee. (See FP 14.30.02 and 14.16.03)
(Note: On the submission under 37 CFR 3.73(b), the signature of an attorney or agent registered to practice before the Office is not sufficient, unless the attorney or agent is authorized to act on behalf of the assignee.)
☐ The TD is not signed (See FPs 14.26 and 14.26.03)
☐ The serial number of the application (or the number of the patent) which forms the basis for the double patenting is not identified (i.e., missing or incorrect) in the TD. (See FP 14.32)
☐ The serial number of the application being examined (or the number of the patent under reexam or reissue) is not identified or incorrect. (See FPs 14.26 and 14.26.04 or 14.26.05)
☐ The TD is not signed by all owners. See FPs 14.26 and 14.26.06.
☐ The period disclaimed is incorrect or not specified. (See FPs 14.24, 14.27.02 or 14.27.03)
☑ Other . 37 CFR 1.321(c)(3) requires that a TD "Include a provision that any patent granted on that application or any patent subject to the reexamination proceeding shall be enforceable only for and during such period that said patent is commonly owned with the application or patent which formed the basis for the judicially created double patenting." [Emphasis added] The words "legal title" do not include common ownership as to equitable title.
It has been determined that the language (35 USC 155 and 156) makes the TD indefinite as those statutes do not cover the same rights. See the end of Chapter 1499 or the form paragraphs in 1490 for language that is clear and complies with the TD rules.